

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26 and 28-36 were examined in the Non-final Office Action mailed on 03/19/2009 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

By virtue of this paper, claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 are sought to be amended and claims 2, 12, 22 and 32 are sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellations are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-21, 23-26, 28-31 and 33-36 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration in view of the below remarks.

Telephone Interview

As noted above, a telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Choi on July 14, 2009. Only the Undersigned Representative and Examiner Choi are believed to be the participants.

The Undersigned Representative noted the differences of the subject application from U.S. Patent Number 5,774,661 issued to Chatterjee *et al* (hereafter "Chatterjee"). In particular, it was pointed out that claimed extension points approach to customization is fundamentally different from the workflow editor based approach of Chatterjee. The workflow editor of Chatterjee simply contemplates that each user edit a workflow for a desired customization.

In sharp contrast, the present invention provides an extension point, and each of multiple users can provide their own desired customizations by simply specifying the respective custom tasks having custom program logic.

Furthermore, such customizations are performed **without editing** the base work flow. In sharp contrast, Chatterjee simply provides a general work flow editor.

The Applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. The Examiner is respectfully requested to send a duly completed Interview

Summary form PTOL 413 if one has not been sent already. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

5 Claims 2, 12, 22 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is rendered moot in view of the cancelation of the corresponding claims.

10 However, it is noted that currently independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 recite 'multiple' users, which is believed to be definite.

 Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and continuation of examination is respectfully requested.

15

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102/103

 Claims 1-4, 8-14, 18-24, and 28-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5, 774, 661 issued to Chatterjee *et al* in view US Patent No. 7, 013, 316 issued to Hansen *et al*.

20

 Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the Outstanding Office Action, it is respectfully noted that the presented claims are allowable over the art of record at least for the reasons noted above.

25

 As to Applicable law, it is noted that the Office is permitted to give each term in the claim its broadest **reasonable** construction **consistent with the specification**. Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The PTO determines the scope of claims in patent applications not solely on the basis of the claim language, but upon giving claims their broadest reasonable construction "in light of the specification as it would be
30 interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art." In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr., 367 F.3d 1359, 1364[, 70 USPQ2d 1827] (Fed. Cir. 2004).

As a threshold matter, Chatterjee does not teach or reasonably suggest the concept of custom tasks (as would be appreciated by one skilled in the relevant arts). This is because Chatterjee relates to a work flow editor, where a single user has the ability to modify/ define work flows of interest to incorporate desired program logics/tasks.

Under the required reasonable construction legal standard noted above, one skilled in the relevant arts would not find the claimed custom tasks in the disclosure of Chatterjee (as also further defined in claim 2). The Examiner's interpretation in the previous office action was unreasonable.

Secondly, the extension points of the present invention have the inherent feature that the execution of the work flow continues from the extension point, while providing for execution of the custom task associated with the extension point. This feature is expressly recited in the amended independent claims.

In sharp contrast, Chatterjee does not contemplate the claimed extension points because there is no inherent requirement that execution continue from the extension points. Rather, Chatterjee provides the user/editor to define any desired flow based on decision points. In support of this position, Applicants point to the below disclosure of Chatterjee:

Turning now to the example workflow of builder display 300, this workflow commences by data entry 311 for a new purchase order. Execution of "data frm entry" object 311 provides the user with a prompt to enter data. In this case, the data requested is purchase order data, defined using workflow administrator 216. Next, decision point 312 checks such data for certain properties, defined by the user in a manner described in connection with FIG. 4. **As a result of this decision point 312, work flow processing will be routed either for further data entry 313 or to connection object "Accepted PO Path" 317.** In the latter case, connection object "Accepted PO Path" 317 joins data from decision point 312 and decision point 314, database retrieval object 318 accesses a selected database and retrieves a specific record therefrom, and icons 319 and 320 indicate that the workflow is complete. Otherwise, data entry object 313 prompts the user for further input, **decision point object 314 provides routing in response to the input data, and as a result the workflow either progresses to connection object Accepted PO Path317, indicating acceptance, or to work basket object 315, indicating rejection.** In the latter event, work basket object 315 performs further processing, such as presenting a purchase order to a particular user as a rejected purchase order, at which point the work flow is complete, as indicated by icon 316. (Col 7 line 57 to col 8 line 14, **Emphasis Added**)

Accordingly, currently amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 2-6 and 8-10 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

5 Currently amended independent claims 11, 21, and 31 are also allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Other claims are also allowable over the art of record at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

10 Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome. Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: July 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416